

Presidents Truman, Eisenhower, Kennedy, and Johnson, Secretaries of State Acheson, Dulles, Herter, and Rusk, and every Secretary of Defense in the 17-year period have said on this subject.

President Truman, when he provided money to Turkey and Greece to stop communism, did so on the basis that it was his judgment that we could not suffer the expansion of communism which was threatening the security of the United States. When Eisenhower became President, he subscribed to the signing of the SEATO Convention. It was during his 3 years of administration that we signed a treaty, signatories to which were Australia and New Zealand. We signed treaties with Taiwan, Japan, and Korea. Every one of those treaties, I say to the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], declared that we could not suffer the expansion of communism, because such expansion would be a threat to the security of the United States.

I challenge Senators to examine every treaty which we made in southeast Asia, and to reject, if it is not so, my word that every one contained the declaration that we cannot suffer the expansion of communism without incurring a threat to the security of the United States.

Mr. President, the question is: Are we the aggressors? Only one investigation was made of what the conditions in South Vietnam has been. That investigation was made by the International Control Commission through its legal department that went into South Vietnam. Poland, Canada, and India are members of the International Control Commission. In 1962, they made their report that North Vietnam was sending troops, military equipment, and military supplies into South Vietnam.

What has been our position? We have sent food, primarily in the first 10 years. My recollection is that we have supplied about \$3 billion worth of help to the South Vietnamese people.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I wish to finish my statement.

Mr. HOLLAND. I shall yield to the Senator from Alaska when the Senator from Ohio has completed his remarks. (At this point, Mr. MONTOYA assumed the chair.)

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, we are not the aggressors. I repeat what I have said in this Chamber heretofore. Those who charge that we are prostituting the women of South Vietnam; that we are trying to establish a colonial domination over the human and natural resources of South Vietnam; that we are the perpetrators of atrocities upon innocent men, women, and children; and—the worst charge—that we dressed our Central Intelligence Agency men in the uniforms of Communists and sent them into South Vietnam to rape women and kill innocent men and children so as to put the blame upon the Communists; and that we are demanding unconditional surrender, making it impossible for Ho Chi Minh to go to the negotiating table—those claims are not true, Mr. President.

Our country has been leaning backward in wanting to go to the negotiating

table. Ho Chi Minh refuses to do so. I submit, Mr. President, that he will never do so if on the floor of the Senate the arguments continue to be made that we are the aggressor, that we are creating brothels in South Vietnam, and that we are killing innocent men, women, and children, without one word being said as to what the Communists have been doing and what our men have been suffering.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me so that I may propound a question?

Mr. HOLLAND. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator after the Senator from Ohio has completed his remarks. I agree to yield, first, to the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], then I shall yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK].

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, let us assume we are wrong. It is still your country and my country. In my judgment, blood is being spilled, bodies are being injured, and life is being taken with increasing frequency because we have convinced Ho Chi Minh that Congress is divided and that we are going to pull out.

Those who argue to the contrary, when they are asked, "Shall we pull out?" answer, "No." If the answer is "No," then Senators had better supply the equipment that they need to make the fight.

I yield the floor.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank my distinguished friend from Ohio for going into this question, which I had not expected to go into at all, and do not intend to, because he, too, is dealing with the great question of principle as to whether we are right or wrong in being in South Vietnam. As far as I am concerned, my mind might operate more simply than the minds of the distinguished Senator from Alaska, the distinguished Senator from Oregon, and the distinguished Senator from Ohio. I do not think we are trying to settle that complex problem now. I think we are trying to decide what it is necessary to do to sustain 500,000 American boys—and there are some of our girls there, too—fighting our war, certainly not theirs; they did not choose it.

Several have come home in coffins to my own small hometown in south Florida. It happens that the ranking member of the group was a young Negro captain whose last name is Woodruff, the son of a good man whom I knew throughout 50 to 60 years prior to his death. They are good people. I would hate to think that Captain Woodruff was responsible for our having taken the wrong position—if we did—in South Vietnam.

I agree with the Senator from Ohio. I do not believe that we did. But, I do not think that is the proper question now.

We had a humble white boy brought home a few days ago who never finished high school. I doubt if he ever finished grammar school. He was not capable of deciding the principles or the issues involved in the struggle, as to whether we should or should not be in South Vietnam. All he knew was that Uncle Sam called him. He put on his uniform. He

was taught to shoot. He went over to Vietnam as an infantryman, and he was killed. The men who are doing the fighting did not make the decisions. The decisions have to be made at the higher levels of Government.

We are not making that decision now. I have already stated that if the President be wrong, our people have the full right to express themselves upon that question next year, if they wish to do so. They can express themselves in various way earlier.

It is one of our constitutional duties to supply the means to hold up the hands of our men fighting for us. It is right there in the Constitution, if anyone wishes to look for it. The question is now: Shall we or shall we not appropriate funds which all of the authorities—who should know—including our own distinguished Senators who have studied this question—tell us must be appropriated to give our men the kind of protection, the kind of weapons, the kind of ammunition, the kind of equipment, the kind of clothing, the kind of living quarters, the kind of medical supplies which they need?

Shall we do it, or shall we not?

I think that is the only question. That is the simple question here.

There is ample time to argue the more complex questions of principle. There is a difference of opinion on it. But, I cannot see how anyone can withhold a "yea" vote on an appropriation bill to supply money to half a million American boys in southeast Asia who are fighting for us because they have been ordered to go there and fight.

That half million men need supplies and equipment which will require the spending of money between now and June 30 of this year. In many instances, money has been transferred—as the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Young] has stated—and this will replace money transferred from other appropriations in the Defense Department.

Shall we appropriate these funds needed for expenditure or commitment between now and June 30? That is how simple the question is.

So far as the Senator from Florida is concerned, I am going to vote "yea." I wish I could vote "yea" more than one time. This is not a question of trying to solve the complex reasons and arguments which lie behind the war on one side or the other. This is a question of whether we support our fighting men or whether we do not. It is inconceivable to me that we could do anything but support them.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. If the Senate adopts the policy of determining war policy on an appropriation bill, would it not be a precarious situation, sometime in the future, when we might be engaged in another war, soldiers would be reluctant to enlist because they would not know whether they would be supported financially with adequate equipment and supplies which they would need to fight a war?

Mr. HOLLAND. I believe that it would lead to the worst sort of morale if our fighting men had to consider principle and matters of complex backgrounds